

1  
2  
3  
4  
5 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
6 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

7 CHRIS HAROLD CAVE,  
8 Plaintiff,

9 vs.

10 CLARK COUNTY'S COMMISSION'S BOARD  
11 INC.,  
12 Defendant.

Case No. 2:17-cv-00962-JAD-CWH

**ORDER**

13  
14 Presently before the court is Defendant Clark County's Motion to Quash Service of Process  
15 (ECF No. 8), filed on May 10, 2017. Plaintiff Chris Harold Cave did not respond to the motion.

16 Defendant Clark County requests that the court quash service of process, arguing that  
17 Plaintiff's mailing of an unspecified document to a department of the county government does not  
18 constitute proper service of process under Rule 4 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. Plaintiff  
19 did not respond to the motion, but given the unusual address<sup>1</sup> stated on the motion's certificate of  
20 service, it was unclear to the court whether Plaintiff received service of the motion. The court  
21 therefore ordered Defendant Clark County to serve a copy of its motion on Plaintiff at the address  
22 listed in the court's docket, which is 919 Linn Lane, Las Vegas, NV 89110. (Order (ECF No. 9).)  
23 Defendant Clark County filed an additional proof of service indicating that the motion was mailed  
24 to Plaintiff at the address on the docket sheet on June 13, 2017. Twenty-three days have passed  
25 since the motion was served on Plaintiff and he has not filed a response. *See* LR 7-2(b) (stating

26  
27  
28 <sup>1</sup> The certificate of service states that the motion was mailed to "U.S. ex rel., Chris-Harold, c/o  
919 Linn Lane, near Non-resident, Las Vegas, Nevada State Republic, De jure Continental North  
America, Non Domestic, Not in a Territory District, Nor-Federal Zone, "ZIP" code exempt per: U.S.P.S.  
Dom Mail Man 122.32." (Mot. to Quash (ECF No. 8) at 4.)

1 that the deadline for filing responses to motions is 14 days after service of the motion.) The court  
2 therefore will grant the motion on the grounds that it is unopposed. *See* LR 7-2(d) (stating that the  
3 “failure of an opposing party to file points and authorities in response to any motion . . . constitutes  
4 a consent to the granting of the motion”).

5 IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that Defendant Clark County’s Motion to Quash Service of  
6 Process (ECF No. 8) is GRANTED.

7  
8 DATED: July 6, 2017

9  
10   
11 C.W. Hoffman, Jr.  
12 United States Magistrate Judge  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28